



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

existence? He told John Quincy Adams in 1818 (*Memoirs*, IV. 175) that he had taken extensive minutes. In 1878 they are said to be non-existent; in 1888 we are assured that they are extant. P. xvi, for "Wingaw" read "Winyaw." It is an error to say (p. 25 n.) that Pinckney's letter of December 30, 1818, is printed in the *Documentary History*, at least in any edition known to me; and "some" should read "none" in the statement attributed to Chief Justice Nott as to the preservation of Pinckney's notes.

J. FRANKLIN JAMESON.

*The Territorial Growth of the United States.* By WILLIAM A. MOWRY. (New York: Silver, Burdett, and Co. 1902. Pp. 237.)

THERE are two phases to the expansion of the United States — the circumstances that have at different times created a demand for more territory, and the efforts of government to meet this demand. Dr. Mowry regards our territorial acquisitions as a series of special providences and upon this theory contents himself with the externals of negotiation without making any attempt to present the underlying causes. Even his statement of the externals is far from satisfactory. He gives no adequate account of the situation that caused the cession of Louisiana, and no account at all of the protracted negotiations resulting in the Florida treaty, not even mentioning the prior acts for occupation. In connection with Texas something is said of slavery, but nothing of the other influences that brought about annexation and caused the Mexican War. There is no reference to the internal agitation for Oregon nor to the way in which Oregon was used to offset Texas. Even Alaska did not come wholly out of a clear sky, but in continuation of negotiations, which are not mentioned, that began in 1854, were resumed in 1859, and interrupted by the Civil War. There is no suggestion of American connection with the Hawaiian Revolution of 1893, and the Philippines were "thrust upon us" unsought. From this it follows that the book fails to tell the true story of the territorial growth of the United States. On the one hand, it omits entirely the reckless disregard of the rights of others that has characterized our national expansion and, on the other, it gives no glimpse of the restless energy of the American people to which that expansion is due. The materials are drawn from secondary sources, chiefly from Lyman's *Diplomacy of the United States*, Marbois's *Louisiana*, and Greenhow's *Oregon*. The style of the book is entertaining and its typographical appearance attractive, which make it the more to be regretted that the subject-matter is superficial.

There are some errors of detail. We find the familiar misstatement that the first Virginia charter granted to the London and Plymouth Companies *all* the territory between the thirty-fourth and forty-fifth parallels instead of a statement that to each was granted a tract one hundred miles square, to be located within the limits designated. A reference to Mitchell's Map copies a misprint in Lyman that misspells the name. Ly-

man's unsupported statement that Jefferson was unofficially notified in 1802 of Napoleon's willingness to sell Louisiana is accepted, although at variance with the story of Napoleon's sudden decision in the following year, which is quoted from Marbois. Much is made of Captain Shelvocke's supposed discovery of gold in California in 1720, but it does not appear that Captain Shelvocke touched only the extreme southern point of Lower California and never saw any part of the territory acquired by the United States. The so-called "flathead delegation" is assigned to 1832, although recent discussion has shown that it took place the preceding year. Whitman's ride is mentioned very briefly, but without indicating any modification of the author's opinions in regard to it. It is hardly accurate to say that our government claimed that Bering Sea was a *mare clausum*. The House resolution, quoted in construction of the Monroe doctrine, should be dated 1826 instead of 1825. It is at least open to question whether this resolution may fairly be said to have been adopted. It was passed by a close vote as an amendment to a resolution affirming the expediency of the Panama mission, and then the resolution as amended was overwhelmingly defeated.

F. H. H.

*Mallet du Pan and the French Revolution.* By BERNARD MALLET. (London, New York, and Bombay: Longmans, Green, and Co. 1902. Pp. xx, 368.)

BARTHÉLEMY, the diplomatic representative of the convention at Berne, reported to his superiors in 1794 his opinion of Mallet du Pan in these words: "On ne peut se dissimuler que ce Genevois est une vraie mèche d'enfer pour notre pays." Over against this republican opinion may be placed the words spoken at this time by the future Louis XVIII., who was living at Verona as the titular regent of France: "Ce diable d'homme qu'on ne pouvait parvenir à faire taire." These two significant phrases show that the Terrorists whom Mallet bitterly denounced and the Royalists whom he tried faithfully to serve held practically the same opinion of the able Genevan observer and writer who sought to save France from the absurdities of the old tyranny of monarchy without delivering her over to the excesses of a new tyranny of democracy. Between the extremes of reaction and of revolution many may have halted in the trying years following 1789, content to say with Sieyès, "J' ai vécu"; but only a few keener and bolder than their fellows dared to take a decided stand upon middle ground, so that Mallet du Pan found himself a member of no party, but of a small coterie of brilliant men who were masters of the science of politics but knew little of the art. The judgments which will be passed upon this book will differ but little from those passed upon the author's great-grandfather more than a century since. The royalist and the clerical will join with the admirer of the Revolution in condemning this book, which represents the views of the small and unpopular minority who can find little on either side in the French Revolution to admire and are so rash as to speak out their opinions.